UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/584,653 | 12/03/2008 | Torben Falck Orntoft | ORNTOFT 2 | 8207 |
| | 7590 08/20/2010 D NEIMARK, P.L.L.C | EXAMINER | | |
| 624 NINTH ST | | AEDER, SEAN E | | |
| SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1642 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/20/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/584,653 | ORNTOFT ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | SEAN E. AEDER | 1642 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | _• | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 68-135 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 68-135 are subject to restriction and/or | vn from consideration. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner | epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: | te | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 68-107, 121-124, and 128, drawn to methods of classifying cancer comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products.

Group II, claim(s) 108-111, drawn to a method for reducing malignancy comprising contacting a tumor cell with one or more peptides.

Group III, claim(s) 112-115, drawn to a method for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more genes into a tumor cell.

Group IV, claim(s) 116-119, drawn to a method for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more probes into tumor cells to allow said one or more probes to hybridize to one or more genes.

Group V, claim(s) 120, drawn to methods of producing antibodies comprising immunizing a mammal with one or a distinct combination of expression products and obtaining antibodies.

Group VI, claim(s) 125 and 129, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more polypeptide.

Group VII, claim(s) 126 and 130, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more genes.

Group VIII, claim(s) 127 and 131, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more probes.

Group IX, claim(s) 132-135, drawn to a kit comprising one or more markers and instructions for use.

The inventions listed as groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Page 3

The technical feature linking groups I-IX appears to be that they all relate to the special technical feature of methods of classifying cancer comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products.

However, Dietmaier et al (Cancer Research, 57: 4749-4756) teaches methods of classifying cancer comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products (see paragraph spanning pages 4750-4751, in particular).

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of groups I-IX does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Accordingly, groups I-IX are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Group I is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of polynucleotide or polypeptide expression products. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents, response variables, and/or criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group II is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species methods for reducing malignancy comprising contacting a tumor cell with one or more peptides. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of peptides. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents, and/or response variables, and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Page 4

Group III is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more genes into a tumor cell. Each species is identified as one or a specific combination of genes. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents and/or response variables, and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group IV is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more probes into tumor cells to allow said one or more probes to hybridize to one or more genes. Each species is identified by one or a specific combination of probes. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents and/or dosages such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group V is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods of producing antibodies comprising immunizing a mammal with one or a

Application/Control Number: 10/584,653

Art Unit: 1642

distinct combination of expression products and obtaining antibodies. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of expression products. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Page 5

Group VI is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of pharmaceutical compositions comprising one or more polypeptide. Each species is identified by one polypeptide or a specific combination of polypeptides. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group VII is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of pharmaceutical compositions comprising one or more genes. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of genes. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group VIII is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of pharmaceutical compositions comprising one or more probes. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of probes. The species do not relate to a

single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Page 6

Group IX is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of kits comprising one or more markers and instructions for use. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of markers. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SEAN E. AEDER whose telephone number is (571)272-8787. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/584,653 Page 7

Art Unit: 1642

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sean E Aeder/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642